



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/090,399	03/04/2002	Richard V. Pratte	CAMPAGNE-002XX	1816
7590 11/17/2004 Bourque & Associates, P.A. Suite 301 835 Hanover Street Manchester, NH 03104			EXAMINER STEVENS, ROBERT	
			ART UNIT 2176	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 11/17/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/090,399

Applicant(s)

PRATTE, RICHARD V.

Examiner

Robert M Stevens

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 March 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 04 March 2002 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) \*
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/4/2002.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-35 are pending in Application No. 10/090,399, entitled "Displaying Database Information as a Document Metaphor", filed 3/4/2002 by Pratte. Claims 1, 19 and 35 are independent.

2. The Office acknowledges Information Disclosure Statement filed on 3/4/2002.

#### ***Priority***

3. Applicant makes no claim to either domestic or foreign priority.

#### ***Drawings***

4. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: Fig. 8 #60.

5. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference character(s) not mentioned in the description: Fig. 8 # 60b-60g.

6. Fig. 8-15 contain (what appears to be) graphics that Applicant is using as reference numbers. They are inappropriate for several reasons. First of all, these numbers (1-11) are low enough as to conflict with Figure numbers (1-15). Additionally, these numbers are encircled/enclosed in a black background. (Refer to 37 CFR 1.84(p)(1) and (3)) Third, the associated "hand" cursors are not appropriate as lead lines. (Refer to 37 CFR 1.84(q))

7. Corrected drawing sheets are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c) and 1.121(d)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

***Specification***

8. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

A. The last sentence of [0004] uses the word "section" rather than "sections". The 6<sup>th</sup> line of [0022] is confusing: "deployed remotely on an over network". Second sentence of [0024] "maybe" should be "may be". Applicant is reminded to please correct all spelling/grammatical/etc. mistakes throughout the specification (including the claims and drawings).

B. Applicant uses same drawing reference number to refer to different Figure elements, such as:

1. #12 to refer to a database (information store, see [0016]) and database records (information stored, see [0022]).

2. #14a to refer to a document metaphor (see [0027]) and a document profile (see [0028]).

Applicant is asked to please reconcile all such inconsistencies.

C. [0029] describes toggling between data entry and view modes by clicking on a field. Which field?

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

9. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the

Art Unit: 2176

art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

10. **Claims 14-15, 18, 30-31 and 34 are rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph**, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

**Regarding claim 14**, no implementation details were provided for allowing “a user to move ... to another record”.

**Claim 15** is dependent upon claim 14, and therefore likewise rejected.

**Claims 30-31** are substantially similar to claims 14-15, respectively, and therefore likewise rejected.

**Regarding claim 18**, no implementation details were provided for the “the expandable text containing field” of line 2.

**Claim 34** is substantially similar to claim 18, and therefore likewise rejected.

11. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Art Unit: 2176

12. **Claims 1-18, 20-22, 26, 33 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph**, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

**Regarding independent claim 1**, there is a lack of antecedent basis as to "said database" in line 10.

**Claims 2-18** are dependent upon claim 1 and therefore likewise rejected.

**Regarding claims 10, 26 and 35**, the scope is vague and indefinite. The term "responsive" (claim 10 line 2; claim 26 line 2; claim 35 lines 5,7,11) is vague.

Responsive in what manner(s)?

**Regarding claims 17 and 33**, the scope is vague and indefinite. The phrase "displayed in HTML code" (claim 17 line 2; claim 33 line 2) is vague. Display HTML code listing or display rendered HTML code?

**Regarding claim 20**, the scope is vague and indefinite. The recited limitation ("includes a data entry view mode and a data display view mode") does not appear to add anything to the parent claim (which recites switching "between a data entry view mode and a data display view mode").

**Claims 21-22** are dependent upon claim 20 and therefore likewise rejected.

**Additionally, in regards to claim 35**, the term “sew” (line 12) appears to be in error, rendering the scope indeterminable. The Office will consider this word to be “the” for the purposes of further examination.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

13. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

14. **Claims 1-11, 14-17, 19-27, 30-33 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)** as being unpatentable over Segal et al (US Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0041991, filed Feb. 6, 2001, relying on Provisional Application No. 60/181,215, filed Feb. 9, 2000, hereafter referred to as “Segal”) in view of T. C. Bradley (ColdFusion: Fast & Easy Web Development, Prima Publishing, Roseville, CA, © 2000, pp. 153-157, 183-185, 208-214, 228-235, 247-248, 268-269, 309-310, 357-361 and 371-377, hereafter referred to as “Bradley”).

**Regarding independent claim 1**, Segal discloses:



*A system (Fig. 1) for use in presenting at east one record of information, including a plurality of fields of data, as a textual document that can be displayed and edited (Fig. 5i), said system comprising:*

*a data display device; (Fig. 1 #106, 108 and 110)*  
*at least one data entry device; (Fig. 1 keyboard shown with each PC #106, 108, 110 and [0112] re: "clicks" and enters data)*  
*an information store containing at least one data record; (Fig. 1 #132) and*  
*a data handler (Fig. 1 #102 and 134), coupled to (Fig 1 #99) said information store (Fig. 1 #132) and to aid data display device(Fig. 1 #106, 108 and 110), for accessing said data base (Fig. 1 #132) and for retrieving at least a portion of said at least one data record ([0028], discussing means to retrieve ... medical data), said data handler for creating a document metaphor (Fig. 5h) containing said at least a portion of said at least one retrieved data record ([0028], discussing means to retrieve ... medical data) for display on said data display device (Fig. 1 #106, 108, 110), said document metaphor (Fig. 5h) allowing ... , on said data display device (Fig. 1 #106, 108, 110), of at least a portion of said retrieved data record as a text document. (Fig. 5h)*

However, Segal does not explicitly disclose:

*sequential viewing*

Bradley, though, discloses:

*sequential viewing (p. 309, bottom GUI is a scrollable window)*

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Bradley for the benefit of Segal, because to do so would allow a user to view more than one page of information, as taught by Bradley in the series of GUI windows displayed on pp. 309-310. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the display of database records.

**Regarding claim 2**, which is dependent upon claim 1, the limitations of claim 1 have been previously addressed.

However, Segal does not explicitly disclose:

*wherein said document metaphor is viewable in its entirety by sequentially scrolling downward and upward through said document metaphor.*

Bradley, though, discloses:

*wherein said document metaphor is viewable in its entirety by sequentially scrolling downward and upward through said document metaphor. (p. 309, bottom GUI is a scrollable window)*

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Bradley for the benefit of Segal, because to do so would allow a user to view more than one page of information, as taught by Bradley in the series of GUI windows displayed on pp. 309-310. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the display of database records.

**Regarding claim 3**, which is dependent upon claim 1, Segal further discloses:

*wherein said document metaphor includes a plurality of data record elements. ([0078], re: personal information in an account database linked to medical data in a clinical database)*

**Regarding claim 4**, which is dependent upon claim 3, Segal further discloses:

*wherein said document metaphor includes a data entry view mode and a data display view mode. (Fig. 5h displaying data and having an edit button to toggle to a data entry mode)*

**Regarding claim 5**, which is dependent upon claim 4, Segal further discloses:

*wherein the view mode of a selected data record may be toggled between said data entry view mode and said data display view mode by signaling on said data record element by said at least one data entry device. (Fig. 5h displaying data and having an edit button to toggle to a data entry mode by clicking on the edit button)*

**Regarding claim 6**, which is dependent upon claim 5, Segal further discloses:

*wherein said at least one data entry device includes a mouse, and wherein said signaling includes double-clicking on said selected data record element. ([0112] discusses user "clicking". Mouse events are well known in the art. See the Deitel et al. reference [Deitel, H. M., et al., Java: How to Program, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition, Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ, © 1998, pp. 546-558.] cited in the Form 892 for a list of mouse events and the code to handle mouse events, like multiple clicks [e.getClickCount()] in line 22 of Fig. 10-22)*

**Regarding claim 7**, which is dependent upon claim 1, Segal further discloses:

*wherein said data base includes at least one record selected from at least one of the group of information stores consisting of an e-mail record data base, a calendar record data base; a report record data base; and a user defined record data base. (Fig. 1 #132 account database and [0112] re: user entry of data)*

**Regarding claim 8**, which is dependent upon claim 1, Segal further discloses:

*wherein said document metaphor includes at least one section, said at least one section including a plurality of data record elements. (Fig. 5h)*

**Regarding claim 9**, which is dependent upon claim 8, the limitations of claim 8 have been previously addressed.

However, Segal does not explicitly disclose:

*wherein a users view of said at least one document metaphor section on said display device may be expanded and contracted.*

Bradley, though, discloses:

*wherein a users view of said at least one document metaphor section on said display device may be expanded and contracted. (p. 309, the Internet Explorer windows each have a button [middle button at far right of title bar] for maximizing and restoring [contracting] the window.)*

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Bradley for the benefit of Segal, because to do so would allow a user to view more than one page of information, as taught by Bradley in the series of GUI windows displayed on pp. 309-310. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the display of database records.

**Regarding claim 10**, which is dependent upon claim 1, Segal further discloses:

*wherein said document handler is responsive to a data record request input by a user on said at least one data entry device. ([0112] re: "clicks" and enters data)*

**Regarding claim 11**, which is dependent upon claim 1, the limitations of claim 1 have been previously addressed.

However, Segal does not explicitly disclose:

*wherein said document metaphor includes a static header portion and a static footer portion.*

Bradley, though, discloses:

*wherein said document metaphor includes a static header portion and a static footer portion.* (Figure shown on p. 185 and 1<sup>st</sup> two paragraphs discussing document header and footer portions)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Bradley for the benefit of Segal, because to do so would allow a user to view more than one page of information, as taught by Bradley in the series of GUI windows displayed on pp. 309-310. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the display of database records.

**Regarding claim 14**, which is dependent upon claim 7, Segal further discloses:

*wherein said document metaphor allows a user to move from one record of a first information store to another record.* (Fig. 5c, left side of GUI shows links to predetermined sections)

**Regarding claim 15**, which is dependent upon claim 14, Segal further discloses:

*wherein said one record in said first information store includes a hyperlink to said another record. ([0078], re: personal information in an account database linked to medical data in a clinical database)*

**Regarding claim 16**, which is dependent upon claim 1, Segal further discloses:

*wherein said document metaphor is displayed as a web page.*  
([0084] re: use of web pages)

**Regarding claim 17**, which is dependent upon claim 16, the limitations of claim 16 have been previously addressed.

However, Segal does not explicitly disclose:

*wherein said document metaphor is displayed in HTML code.*

Bradley, though, discloses:

*wherein said document metaphor is displayed in HTML code. (The use of HTML to create web pages is well known in the art, as shown in the Figures of pp. 183-184 [html code] and p. 185 [the rendered HTML page].)*

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Bradley for the benefit of Segal, because to do so would allow a user to view more than one page of information, as taught by Bradley in the series of GUI windows displayed on pp. 309-310. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the display of database records.

**Regarding independent claim 19, Segal discloses:**

*A computer program, residing in a storage medium (Fig. 1 #134), for use in presenting at least one record of information including a plurality of field of data as a textual document which can be displayed and edited (Fig. 5h), the program comprising executable instructions which enable a computer system to:*

*allow a user to select a record from, an information store to be viewed; ([0028], discussing user with access and the means to retrieve ... medical records)*

*retrieve at least a portion of the selected record; ([0028], especially means to retrieve medical data)*

*present, on a data display device (Fig. 1 #106, 108 and 110), at least a portion of the retrieved record as a document metaphor (Fig. 5h) allowing ... of the displayed portion of the record; (Fig. 5h) and*

*allowing the user to switch the view of the document metaphor between a data entry view mode and a data display view mode. (Fig. 5h)*

However, Segal does not explicitly disclose:

*sequentially viewing*

Bradley, though, discloses:

*sequentially viewing* (p. 309, bottom GUI is a scrollable window)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Bradley for the benefit of Segal, because to do so would allow a user to view more than one page of information, as taught by Bradley in the series of GUI windows displayed on pp. 309-310. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the display of database records.

**Claims 20-27** are substantially similar to claims 4-11, and therefore likewise rejected.

**Claims 30-33** are substantially similar to claims 14-17, and therefore likewise rejected.

**Regarding independent claim 35**, Segal discloses:

*A method for presenting at; least one record of information including a plurality of fields of data as a textual document which can be displayed and edited (Fig. 5h), said method comprising the acts of:*

*providing a data handler (Fig. 1 #102 and 134), responsive, in use, to at least one information store containing at least one data record; (Fig. 1 #132 account database)*

*responsive, in use, to a user request for access ([0084] users enter appropriate address to access database) to at least a portion of at east one record, accessing said information store ([0084] user access of database) and retrieving at least a portion of said at least one data record; (Fig. 5h) and*

*responsive to said accessing and retrieving, creating a document metaphor (Fig. 5h) allowing sew [?] ... on said data display device (Fig. 1 #106, 108, 110) as a textual document. (Fig. 5l [i.e., 5"L"], especially the "Notes" section)*

However, Segal does not explicitly disclose:

*viewing of at least a portion of said retrieved data record*

Bradley, though, discloses:



Art Unit: 2176

*viewing of at least a portion of said retrieved data record (p. 309, bottom GUI is a scrollable window)*

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Bradley for the benefit of Segal, because to do so would allow a user to view more than one page of information, as taught by Bradley in the series of GUI windows displayed on pp. 309-310. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the display of database records.

15. **Claims 12-13 and 28-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)** as being unpatentable over Segal et al (US Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0041991, filed Feb. 6, 2001, relying on Provisional Application No. 60/181,215, filed Feb. 9, 2000, hereafter referred to as "Segal") in view of T. C. Bradley (ColdFusion: Fast & Easy Web Development, Prima Publishing, Roseville, CA, © 2000, pp. 153-157, 183-185, 208-214, 228-235, 247-248, 268-269, 309-310, 357-361 and 371-377, hereafter referred to as "Bradley") and further in view of Applicant Admitted Prior Art (hereafter "AAPA").

**Regarding claim 12**, which is dependent upon claim 1, the limitations of claim 1 have been previously addressed.

However, Segal does not explicitly disclose:

*wherein said document metaphor further includes at least one of a navigation bar and a command bar.*

AAPA, though, discloses:

*wherein said document metaphor further includes at least one of a navigation bar and a command bar. (See Applicant's Specification [0026])*

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of AAPA for the benefit of Segal in view of Bradley, because to do so would provide a user with access to numerous commands, as taught by AAPA in paragraph [0026] of Applicant's Specification. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the display of database records.

**Regarding claim 13**, which is dependent upon claim 12, Segal further discloses:

*wherein said command bar includes a plurality of hyperlinks, each of said plurality of hyperlinks providing a direct access to a pre-determined section of said document metaphor. (Fig. 5c, left side of GUI shows links to predetermined sections)*

**Claims 28-29** are substantially similar to claims 12-13, respectively, and therefore likewise rejected.

16. **Claims 18 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)** as being unpatentable over Segal et al (US Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0041991, filed Feb. 6, 2001, relying on Provisional Application No. 60/181,215, filed Feb. 9, 2000, hereafter referred to as "Segal") in view of T. C. Bradley (ColdFusion: Fast & Easy Web Development, Prima Publishing, Roseville, CA, © 2000, pp. 153-157, 183-185, 208-214, 228-235, 247-248, 268-269, 309-310, 357-361 and 371-377, hereafter referred to as "Bradley") and Michael W. Foley et al. (JFC Unleashed, Sams Publishing, Indianapolis, IN, Dec. 1998, (c) 1999, pp. 160-164, hereafter referred to as "Foley").

**Regarding claim 18**, which is dependent upon claim 1, the limitations of claim 1 have been previously addressed.

However, Segal does not explicitly disclose:

*wherein said document metaphor further includes at least one expandable text containing field which expands in size as more text is provided to be displayed in said field.*

Foley, though, discloses:

*wherein said document metaphor further includes at least one expandable text containing field which expands in size as more text is provided to be displayed in said field. (p. 163 Fig. 7.6)*

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Foley for the benefit of Segal in view of Bradley, because to do so would a programmer to create a lightweight textual component that

Art Unit: 2176

supports multiple lines of plain text, as taught by Foley in the 1<sup>st</sup> line under section "The JTextArea Class" on p. 160. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., the programming of graphical user interfaces.

**Claim 34** is substantially similar to claim 18, and therefore likewise rejected.

### ***Conclusion***

17. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

#### **Non-patent Literature**

Mohnike, Charles, Sams Teach Yourself Macromedia ColdFusion 5 in 21 Days, Sams Publishing, Indianapolis, IN, First Printing Jul. 2001, © 2002, pp. 135-158.

Adams, Chris, "Building a Flexible Internet Architecture", CGK Technologies Group, © 2000, pp. 1-3.

Birchall, Andy, "The Data Path: From Database to Web Page and Back Again", ColdFusion Developer's Journal, vol. 1 issue 1, Jan/Feb 1999, pp. 22-25.

Caras, Geoff, "Dynamic Variable Length Forms", ColdFusion Developer's Journal, vol. 1 issue 1, Jan/Feb 1999, pp. 38-39.

Bradenbaugh, Jerry, "Leveraging ColdFusion: Putting Client/Server on the Web, Part 1", ColdFusion Developer's Journal, vol. 1 issue 1, Jan/Feb 1999, pp. 10-12, 14 and 16.

Tauber, Daniel A., et al, Mastering Microsoft Frontpage 2000, Premium Edition, Sybex, Inc., San Francisco, CA, © 1999, pp. 642-643 and 740-744.

Rubin, Charles, Running Microsoft Word 2000, Microsoft Press, Redmond, WA, © 1999, pp. 715-725.

Deitel, H. M., et al., Java: How to Program, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition, Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ, © 1998, pp. 546-558.

Art Unit: 2176

***US Patent Application Publications***

Alston et al	US2002/0165936
Caplan et al	US2002/0077946
Wise et al	US2004/0098269
Mui et al	US2003/0229529
Ossip et al	US2003/0018509

***US Patents***

Touma et al	6,160,549
Lautzenheiser et al	6,351,734
Appleman et al	5,918,010
Touma et al	5,809,266
Bly et al	5,220,657
Vertelney et al	5,341,293

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert M Stevens whose telephone number is (571) 272-4102. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:00 - 2:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph H. Feild can be reached on (571) 272-4090. The current fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306. Additionally, the main number for Technology Center 2100 is (571) 272-2100.

Art Unit: 2176

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Robert M. Stevens  
Art Unit 2176  
Date: November 1, 2004

  
JOSEPH FEILD  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

rms